



Disaster Risk Reduction in Nusa Tenggara

Award Number: AID-OFDA-G-14-00136

Quarterly Report: August 15th – September 30th 2014

I. Executive Summary

This report covers the first 6 weeks of the two-year *Disaster Risk Reduction Program in Nusa Tenggara* project, which is supported by USAID/OFDA and implemented by World Neighbors (WN). The project covers three USAID/OFDA sectors 1) Agriculture and Food Security, 2) Risk Management Policy and Practice, 3) Economic Recovery and Market Systems. The goal of the project is to strengthen the ability of vulnerable communities in Nusa Tenggara to effectively respond to the impact of disasters they may face as a result of climate change, which will be accomplished through the following two objectives 1) To improve the food security of the target populations, and 2) To improve the disasters resilience of the target populations. In implementing this project, World Neighbors will partner with seven local NGOs across seven districts.

II. A comparison of actual accomplishments, both for the reporting period and cumulatively, with the established goals, objectives, and expected results

	Sector				
Accomplishments	Agriculture and Food Security Risk Management Policy and Practice		Economic Recovery and Market Systems		
Number of	0	0	0		
beneficiaries reached					
this quarter					
Cumulative number	10,000	10,000	10,000		
of beneficiaries					
targeted					
Cumulative number	0	0	0		
of beneficiaries					
reached					

As this report covers only the first 6 weeks of the project, from August 15th – September 30th 2014, there is no beneficiary accomplishments to report on. But despite this very limited timeframe, a substantial amount of work has been completed:

- In-House Staff Training

All WN Indonesia staff were trained in the project documents; USAID/OFDA rules and regulations; mainstreaming of gender, elderly and persons with disabilities; code of ethics to be applied when implementing USAID/OFDA projects, and the implementation strategies to be used in the field. Staff were also trained in the formats to be used for partner program plans, budgets, baseline data collection, village selection and FOGs (Fixed Obligation Grants).

- Long-Listing of Potential Village Project Sites

WN staff met with district government agencies (Disaster Management Agency, Environment Agency, Food Security Agency, and Agriculture Department) across the seven target districts, and collected individual village data on their level of threat from disasters; level of food insecurity and vulnerability to climate change. Those villages which returned results from moderate to very high in all three sectors were included as potential project sites. 15 – 20 villages were chosen as possible candidates in each of the seven districts.

- Local Partners Capacity Assessments

Although these assessments began during WN's proposal application process to USAID/OFDA, during this reporting period the assessments were completed and formed the basis for subsequent Memorandum of Negotiations. All partners were assessed using four variables, namely program management, financial management, technical capabilities on climate change and disaster risk reduction, and past experience. Each variable was assessed using a number of indicators. All selected partners returned scores of adequate to good, signalling that WN will complete and sign a FOG with them during the next reporting period.

- Inception Training for Local Partners

WN brought together 15 program and finance staff from the seven local partners who will be implementing the project. The participants were given in-depth knowledge on the program and their roles; targets and indicators; program and financial reporting; USAID/OFDA rules and regulations; USAID sub-awarding methods; village selection procedures and WN code of ethics. Together with WN staff, the partners then worked on their draft program work plans, budgets and FOGs.

- Consultation and Coordination with Local Governments

Following the workshop, the partners returned to their districts and, together with WN field staff, consulted with their local governments and the Indonesian Red Cross on which villages should be included in the project. This coordination and consultation was intended to build the commitment and cooperation with local government agencies as they will be expected to play a strong role in the implementation of the project. Important information which came to light during these meetings was the existence and coverage of current development programs, government priority locations, and performance and commitment of village leaders. Following these meetings, a list of 10 villages was shortlisted for each district.

- Target Village Selection

Rapid rural appraisals were then conducted using disaster risk analysis tools. From this survey, five villages were chosen from each of the seven districts to be incorporated into the partner's program plan. All 35 villages will have a more in-depth disaster risk assessment once the partner work plans and sub-awards have been finalised and signed. The names of the 35 chosen villages selected can be seen in Appendix 1.

III. Progress on Indicator Targets

		Overall Target	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Overall	
Source	Indicator		Achievement	Achievement	Achievement	Achievement	Achievement	
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		
	Sector 1, Agriculture and Food Security, Objective 1: To improve the food security of the target populations							
	1. Projected increase in number of months of food self-	≥ 10 months	0					
	sufficiency due to distributed seed	(total)						
a	systems/agricultural input for beneficiary							
OFDA	households							
0	2. Number of people benefiting from seed	1,000 (650 male	0					
	systems/agricultural input activities, by sex	and 350						
		female)						
	3. Number of people receiving USG supported training	1,500	0					
	in natural resources management and/or							
	biodiversity conservation.							
	4. Number of hectares under improved technologies or	300	0					
	management practices as a result of USG assistance							
	5. Number of farmers and others who have applied	1,500	0					
	new technologies or management practices as a							
USAID	result of USG assistance							
/SN	6. Number of individuals who have received USG	2,500	0					
	supported short-term agricultural sector productivity							
	or food security training							
	7. Number of rural households benefiting directly from	2,500	0					
	USG interventions							
	8. Number of members of producer organizations and	2,500	0					
	community-based organizations receiving USG							
	assistance							
WN	9. Number of farmers who are food secure for 10	2,000	0					

	months or more						
	Sector 2, Risk Management Policy and Practice, Objective 2: To improve the disaster resilience of the target populations						
	1. Number of people participating in training, by sex	3,500	0				
		2,275 male					
		1,225 female					
	2. Percentage of people trained who retain skills and	70%	0				
	knowledge after two months						
4	3. Percentage of attendees at joint planning meetings	30%	0				
OFDA	who are from the local community						
0	4. Early warning system in targeted community is in	Yes, in 35	0				
	place for all major hazards with appropriate	villages					
	outreach to communities (Y/N)						
	5. Percentage of community members who received at	TBC	0				
	least one early warning message from at least one						
	source prior to a disaster occurring						
	6. Number of institutions with improved capacity to	35 community	0				
	address climate change issues as a result of USG	groups in 35					
	assistance	villages					
	7. Number of stakeholders with increased capacity to		0				
۵	adapt to the impacts of climate variability and	100					
USAID	change as a result of USG assistance ¹						
)	8. Number of people trained in disaster preparedness	3,500	0				
	as a result of USG assistance						
	9. Number of stakeholders implementing risk-reducing		0				
	practices/actions to improve resilience to climate	70					
	change as a result of USG assistance ²						
WN	10. Number of people trained who adopt DRR practices	2,500	0				
Sector 3, Economic Recovery and Market Systems, Objective 3 To improve the disaster resilience of the target populations							
0	1. Number of people, disaggregated by sex, or MSEs	1,000 (650 male	0				

¹ Based on indicator # of people trained on disaster preparedness and climate change through the MSFs, taken from p.39 of the project proposal. ² Based on indicator # of disaster preparedness plans developed by/with help of MSFs and in use, taken from p.40 of the project proposal

newly receiving financial services or continuing to	and 350			
receive financial services due to USAID/OFDA	female)			
support;				
2. Percentage of financial service accounts/groups	70%	0		
supported by USAID/OFDA that are functioning				
properly - percentage of savings groups holding				
regular meetings, collecting on-time member				
contributions, and experiencing on-time repayment				
of internal loans.				
3. Total USD amount channeled into the program area	USD 181,800	0		
through sub-sector activities	(IDR			
	2,000,000,000)			

IV. Reasons why established goals were not met (if applicable), the impact on the program objective(s), and how the impact has been/will be addressed
Nothing significant to report.

V. Success stories (if available) which illustrate the direct positive effects of the program

Nothing significant to report.

VI. How unforeseen circumstances affected overall performance compared to original assumptions (if applicable), how activities were accordingly adjusted or re-targeted;

The original submission of the WN proposal to USAID/OFDA was made on 15th January 2014. The Cooperative Agreement was signed on 15th August 2014. This delay in starting the project will cause a number of challenges. With the start of the wet season (end of October/start of November), communities will be busy working on their land rather than being able to participate fully in the village inception meetings and disaster risk assessments. It will also be more difficult for the disaster risk reduction programs to be accommodated into the village development plans, as these plans are already being finalized, therefore funding to implement the DRR programs through government budgets will be more difficult to secure. During the next quarter, WN will work intensively with local village leaders and district governments to advocate for the integration of the DRR plans into the village plans.

VII. Analysis and explanation of cost overruns or high unit costs

Nothing significant to report.

Annex 1: 35 Selected Villages

No.	Sub-Awardee	District	Village and Sub-District
1	Pusat Studi	West Lombok,	Sekotong Sub-district
	Pembangunan (PSP)	West Nusa	1. Cendi Manik Village
	Development Study	Tenggara	Kuripan Sub-district
	Centre		2. Kuripan Selatan Village
			Lembar Sub-district
			3. Sekotong Timur Village
			4. Mareje Village
			Gerung Sub-district
			5. Banyu Urip Village
2	Berugak Desa	Central Lombok,	Batukliang Utara Sub-district
	Berugak Village	West Nusa	1. Karang Sidemen Village
		Tenggara	Kopang Sub-district
			2. Aik Bual Village
			Praya Barat Sub-district
			3. Selong Blanak Village
			Praya Barat Daya Sub-district
			4. Montong Ajan Village
			5. Montong Sapah Village
3	Lembaga	East Lombok,	Sambelia Sub-district
	Pengembangan Sumber	West Nusa	1. Medayin Village
	Daya Mitra (LPSDM)	Tenggara	2. Dara Kunci Village
	Institute for Resource		3. Sugian Village
	Development Partners		Jerowaru Sub-district
	_		4. Pandan Wangi Village
			5. Batunampar Village
4	Lembaga Studi	Dompu, West Nusa	Pekat Sub-district
	Pengkajian Lingkungan	Tenggara	1. Nangamiro Village
	(LESPEL)		2. Pekat Village
	Institute for		Kempo Sub-district
	Environmental		3. Songgajah Vilalge
	Assessment Study		Kilo Sub-district
			4. Lasi Village
			Dompu
			5. Kerama Bura Village
5	Gerakan Masyarakat	Bima, West Nusa	Sanggar Sub-district
	Peduli Alam Semesta	Tenggara	1. Kore Village
	(GEMPITA)		2. Boro Village
	Movement of		Tambora Sub-district
	Concerned		3. Kawinda Na'e Village
	Communities for the		4. Labuan Kenanga Village
	Natural World		5. Oibura Village
			_
6	Yayasan MitraTani	Nagekeo, East Nusa	Aesesa Sub-district
	Mandiri Flores	Tenggara	1. Tedakisa Village
	(YMTM-F)		Nangaroro Sub-district
	Foundation for		2. Woewutu
	Independent Farming		3. Pagamogo
	Partners, Flores		Wolowae Sub-district
	,		4. Anakoli
			Boawae Sub-district
			5. Nagerawe
7	Lembaga Peduli	East Sumba, East	Hahari Sub-district
	Sejahtera dan Lestari	Nusa Tenggara	1. Napu Village

(PELITA)	2. Kadahang Village
Institute for Prosperous	Kanatang Sub-district
and Sustainable Care	3. Mondu Village
	Mapambuhang Sub-district
	4. Laimeta Village
	Pinupahar Sub-district
	5. Lailunggi VIllage